BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES, 1534-1829

Materials towards a biographical dictionary of Catholic history in the British Isles from the breach with Rome to Catholic Emancipation.

Joint Editors: A. F. Allison, of the Department of Printed Books at the British Museum, and Hon. Librarian to the Catholic Record Society.

D. M. Rogers, of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Volume 1 No. 3

The Arundel Press, Sussex Road, Bognor Regis.

1951

This publication is issued twice yearly, in January and July, to subscribers only. The annual subscription for the two parts is 8s. 6d.

Subscriptions should be addressed to: The Manager, Biographical Studies, the Arundel Press, Sussex Road, Bognor Regis.

Material submitted for publication should be addressed to: The Editor, Biographical Studies, c/o. the Arundel Press, Sussex Road, Bognor Regis.

Foreword

We wish to emphasise the fact that Biographical Studies is, as its subtitle indicates, an experimental work. In the foreword to the first number we wrote:

> "The object of the present publication is to provide the means by which the researches of many individual scholars can gradually be assembled and presented for general use. In addition to separate biographies, it will contain articles covering several generations of family history; and it will also contain briefer studies and notes about men and women for whose lives the collections are still incomplete. These briefer studies and notes will serve the purpose of recording evidence as it comes to light and of stimulating further research, so that they can eventually be incorporated in fuller biographies at a later stage in the work. The intention, therefore, is not to work consecutively through the alphabet from A to Z, nor to cover the period in chronological sequence, but to publish material from anywhere in the field of research as soon as it becomes available."

Corrections to articles will always be gratefully received. The next number (July 1952) will complete the first volume, and it will contain, in addition to a full index of persons mentioned throughout the volume, a list of corrections and additions to some of the articles so far published.

Attention is called to the corrigenda list at the end of each number.

Biographical Studies is reproduced from typewriting on lithographic plates which are checked against copy by the

printer's reader as they come off the machine. These plates cannot be examined by the editor until after they have been chemically "set", and corrections made by the editor entail, in each case, the retyping and setting of the whole plate. Minor errors missed by the printer's reader, or due to faulty copy, therefore, are not corrected in the text but are indicated in the corrigenda list at the end of the number.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vol. 1 no. 3

	Page
1. Table of Abbreviations	166
2. A. Kenny: John Huddleston, O.S.B.	168
3. T. A. Stroud: Father Thomas Wright - A Test case for toleration ..	189
4. W. F. Rea: The authorship of "News from Spayne and and Holland" and its Bearing on the Genuineness of the Confessions of the Blessed Henry Walpole, S.J.	220
5. W. P. Jeffcock and L. E. Whatmore: Some Notes on the Families of the English Martyrs	231
6. T. B. Trappes-Lomax (Ed.): The Birthplace of the Blessed Robert Anderton	235
7. Selective Index of Persons. Vol.1 nos. 1-3	239
8. Corrigenda. Vol.1. no.3	240

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Birt	H. N. Birt: Obit Book of the English Benedictines from 1600-1912. Edinburgh, 1913.
C.B.E.L.	The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. Cambridge, 1940, etc.
C.R.S.	Publications of the Catholic Record Society. London, 1905, etc.
Challoner M.M.P.	R. Challoner: Memoirs of Missionary Priests. ed. J.H. Pollen. London, 1924.
D.N.B.	Dictionary of National Biography. London, 1885, etc.
Douai Diaries 1&2	The First and Second Diaries of the English College, Douai. ed. by the Fathers of the Congregation of the London Oratory. London, 1878.
Foley	H. Foley: Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. London, 1875, etc.
Gillow	J. Gillow: A Literary and Biographical History, or Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics. London, (1885, etc.)
Kirk	J. Kirk: Biographies of English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century. ed. J.H. Pollen and E. Burton. London, 1909.
Knox:Allen	Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen. ed.T.F.Knox. London, 1882.

Palmer	C.F.R. Palmer: Obituary Notices of the Friars Preachers or Dominicans of the English Province, from ... 1650. London, 1884.
S.T.C.	A Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books printed abroad 1475-1640. Compiled by A.W.Pollard and G.R.Redgrave. The Bibliographical Society: London, 1926.
Sommervogel	A.& A.De Backer: Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus. ed. C. Sommervogel. Brussels, 1890, etc.
Wing	D.Wing: Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland ... and of English Books printed in other countries, 1641-1700. The Index Society: New York, 1945, etc.

JOHN HUDDLESTON O. S. B.

Anthony Kenny

The two great moments of John Huddleston's life have made the latter half of it stand out in high relief, while his earlier days have always been lost in obscurity. Everyone knows that he was instrumental in saving the life of Charles II after the battle of Worcester, and that he reconciled the dying King to the Faith; but concerning his childhood, College days and early priestly life the old biographers have little to say. New evidence which has come to light about his youth, and inaccuracies which are common even in the well-documented history of his dealings with the King, make it worth while to try to rewrite the story of his life.

John was born at Farrington Hall, three miles from Preston, on the 15th April 1608, (1) being the second son of Joseph Huddleston who had succeeded his father Andrew as owner of Farrington in Lancashire and Hutton John in Cumberland. He had ten sisters and five brothers, all Catholics, whose names are given by Jackson in his "Papers and Pedigrees mainly relating to Cumberland and Westmoreland" p. 338. We are told by Dodd (3, 490) that he was educated at Douay and ordained a secular priest there at an unknown date. No further information about his early life is given by Foley, Gillow (either in his dictionary, or in the relevant volumes of the C.R.S.) Snow, Birt, or Thompson Cooper in the D.N.B.

But in the Liber Ruber of the English College, Rome, there is a rather interesting entry under the year 1632. It runs:

"723. Ioannes Sandfordus, vere nomine Huddlestonus, Lancastrensis, e Cumbria oriundus, annos 22, habens Confirmatnm. admissus est inter alumnos S.D.N. a R.P. Thoma Fitzherb(ert) Rectore, de mandato em. Card. Barberini Protectoris, die 17 Oct 1632. Accepit iam tonsuram et ordines min. eod. die 21 Maji 1633, in S. Ioann Lat. Factus est subdiaconus die 7 Mart. 1637, in Basil S. Ioannis Lateranensis. Diaconus die 15 et Sacer. die 22 eiusdem mensis. Missus in Angliam 28 Martii 1639. Bene se hic gessit. Accepit facultates ordinarias subscriptas ab Em. Protectore nostro."

In his answers to the questions which were asked of all new students, this John Sandford wrote (Arch. Ven. Coll. Angl. Scritture 23):

"1. Ioannes Huddlestonus, natus ffaringtoni, in comitatu Lancastriae, tria milliaria a Prestono distantis: educatus Huttoniohn in comitatu Cumbriae: vigesimum 2um agit aetatis annum.

2. Parentes habet nobiles, quorum status, cum praeteritis, tum praesentibus haereticorum persecutionibus, ac undecim natorum curâ oneratus nonnihil debilitatur. ffratres habet tres, sorores autem octo, catholicâ fide educatos: cognatos, multos catholicos, multos etiam haereticos.

3. Studuit Blencoviae in comitatu Cumbriae ad decimum quintum aetatis annum sub praeceptore haeretico: absolutis tunc temporis in istâ scholâ humanioribus studiis, domum a parentibus revocatur! ex quo tempore vixit aliquando domi, aliquando Londini, aliquando in comitatu

Eboracensi pro beneplacito parentum, ubi patrui sui sacerdotis olim in hoc Collegio educati, salutari consilio adiutus, Stum Adnomarum vigesimo aetatis anno petiit, ibiq. plus quam integrum annum in schola Syntaxios insumpsit.

4. Prospera utitur valetudine, tum corporis tum animi, ac semper usus fuit: nisi quod aliquando capitis dolore, atque commotionibus febrium, idq. magna ex parte, vel verno, vel autmnali tempore laboravit.

5. Catholicus est, nec umquam a verâ ista fide aberravit."

Who is this John Huddleston, alias Sandford? Is he the man who reconciled Charles II? There are many points in common besides the name. Both were born at Farrington; both were approximately the same age. They were both nephews of Dom Richard Huddleston, O.S.B., a student of the Venerabile from 1601-3, the 'patruus' whose 'salutare consilium' persuaded the young student that he had a vocation (2). Nevertheless the authorities (Foley, Gillow, Birt, the D.N.B.) are unanimous that they were different people.

Foley states that John Sandford (we shall call the Venerabile student by this name to avoid confusion) was the cousin of the famous Huddleston. The family tree, according to him, is as follows:

Andrew Huddleston the elder, died 1601

Joseph, of Farrington	Andrew, of Hutton John	Richard, O.S.B. student at the English College, Rome.
John Huddleston, who became a Benedictine & reconciled Chas II.	John, alias Sandford who was a student of the English Coll. Rome.	

Foley goes on to say (Records, V. 591) that John Sandford was a Prefect at the English College in 1638, that he later joined the Jesuits "at what precise time is not known"; and that "he was moreover the author of a MS consisting of more than 1,200 pages, giving a detailed account of interesting events relating to English Catholics in general and to the Colleges and missionaries of the Society of Jesus in particular, from the accession of Elizabeth to 1649. Bishop Challoner, whilst compiling his memoirs of missionary priests, obtained the loan of it, expressing that in his judgement it was the most valuable English MS on Catholic affairs that he had met with." This manuscript, it seems, was lost at the time of the dissolution of the Jesuit Colleges, and has never been recovered.(3). Finally Foley clinches the matter by saying that Sandford died on 2nd August, 1667.(4). There seems, then, to be no possibility of identifying the two men and thus filling in the lacuna in the life of John Huddleston.

But it is interesting to see how on examination Foley's circumstantial life of John Sandford fades away. The details we have given are taken from the fifth volume of Records, published in 1879. By 1883, when the seventh volume appeared, he had discovered that the date of Sandford's death was unknown, and that the one he had

previously given on the authority of Oliver's "Collections.." was an error due to a confusion with Fr. John Stafford. S.J. Gillow, writing in his dictionary four years later (III, 468) pointed out that the only reason why Sandford had ever been supposed to have joined the Jesuits was that his manuscript dealt mainly with Jesuit Colleges(5); and he rightly suggests that this proof is inconclusive. It does not seem possible that a manuscript dealing with events up to 1649 could have been written, as Gillow thought, while Sandford was still at Rome (i.e. before 1639), even had his studies allowed him the time to produce so lengthy and mature a work. However, Oliver's statement that the Manuscript dealt mainly with the Colleges and missionaries of the Society of Jesus merely implies that it treated chiefly of Rome and St. Omer, at both of which Sandford had studied. It is natural that he should place most emphasis on the triumphs of the Colleges to which he had a personal loyalty rather than on those in whose history he had a merely academic interest. It thus appears that we know nothing of John Sandford's life after his Ordination.

Further examination shows that we know nothing of John Huddleston's life before Ordination (except for the few items of family history given above.) Dodd, it is true, states that he was educated at Douay, and Gillow and the D.N.B. follow him, but this statement cannot be accepted since Huddleston's name does not appear in any of the Douay diaries. There is mention, however, of one John Carey, alias Huddleston, son of Thomas Carey of Lancashire, who was a convictor and philosopher at Douay from 1623 until 1627. It seems obvious that Dodd's remark was due to a confusion with this man - a pardonable error since, on the supposition that John Huddleston became a philosopher at the usual age of eighteen, the dates tally perfectly. Thus we have a

dovetailing of the lives of Sandford and Huddleston which makes identification of them very tempting if the difficulties can be surmounted.

The greatest of these is of course Foley's statement that John Sandford was the son of Andrew Huddleston of Hutton John, whereas the father of the famous Huddleston was certainly Joseph of Farrington Hall. (6). Foley's evidence rests on a pedigree "contributed by a descendant of the Sawston line (of the Huddleston family) whose kindness has supplemented several of these records." This pedigree, which he gives on p. 583 of his 5th volume of records, is extremely inaccurate, and in fact contains errors in every generation I have been able to check (e.g. it gives the number of sons of Andrew the elder as four instead of seven; it does not know the name of John Huddleston's father; it makes Andrew Huddleston of Hutton John the eldest son of Andrew the elder of Farrington, whereas he was actually the fifth; and it makes Andrew III, who succeeded to the headship of the family after Joseph's death, a son of Andrew II instead of Joseph). (7). Little reliance is therefore to be placed on its unsupported evidence. In the far more trustworthy pedigrees given by Jackson (Papers..of Cumberland, 338) and Burk's Landed Gentry for 1900, there is no evidence that Andrew of Hutton John had any children at all, or even that he was married; and since after his death Hutton John passed to the elder branch of the family it seems at least probable that he left no heirs.

In view of the insufficiency of Foley's evidence, Dom Roger Huddleston, writing in the Catholic Encyclopedia (VII, 511) favours the identification of the two men, Sandford and Huddleston. However he gives no proof of his

hypothesis, fails to clear up many difficulties which remain and leaves the question still open for discussion. Accordingly, Birt, in his necrology, and Gasquet, in the Obit Book of the Venerable English College, continue to oppose the identification after 1905, as does Gillow in vol. 20 of the C.R.S. In fact the only person who accepted Dom Roger's suggestion was the writer of a brief article in the Catholic Times of Dec. 28, 1928.

But recently a document has come to light in the archives of the English College, Rome, which seems to put it beyond all reasonable doubt that John Huddleston and John Sandford are one and the same person. This is the Iuramentum which the latter wrote on the 1st of May, 1633. In the first place it supplies us with an excellent specimen of his handwriting which Mr. Allison has very kindly compared for me with the writing of the Obits which John Huddleston noted in his Missal during the years 1639-1663. There are many similarities between the hands (both are neat and clear, with about the same angle of slope; both are Italian in formation with hardly a trace of Court Hand influence) and the differences (a tendency to flourish in the capital 'E' and the small 'g' and 'd' which is present only in the Iuramentum) are easily explained since one was a formal document written in youth, the other a collection of notes made many years later.

Secondly, it is the only document which gives the name of John Sandford's father, which for some reason he omitted to state in his Responsa, though it was certainly one of the questions asked and all the rest of his class answered it. "Ego Ioannes Huddlestonus," the Iuramentum runs, "filius Iosephi, dioecesis Carliolensis, plenam habens huius Collegii

notitiam,...legibus ipsius me sponte subjicio." At last, therefore, we know that John Huddleston, alias Sandford, was the son of Joseph Huddleston of Farrington Hall, and therefore identical with the man who reconciled Charles II; and Foley's "Jesuit son of Andrew of Hutton John" is seen to be a purely mythical personage. (8).

Though the identification of the two men seems certain, there remain difficulties to solve. John Huddleston had ten sisters and five brothers. (Jackson, 338). John Sandford's Responsa state that his parents were "undecim natorum cura onerati" and immediately afterwards that he has "ffratres tres, sorores autem octo". Is his arithmetic sadly deficient, or has he forgotten to count himself? The answer is surely that he is giving the number of children who were an "onus" on his parents (he is explaining why their "nobilis status debilitatur") and hence he does not include himself who is now an "alumnus Dni. nostri Papae". This fits excellently with John Huddleston whose parents had then (1632) only eight daughters and three sons still dependent on them (two daughters having died in infancy, and two sons come of age: the elder, Andrew, was married that very year and went to live at Hutton John). (9).

There is a further difficulty. From the recusant rolls, which record fines paid regularly between 1603 and 1635, and from a lawsuit of 1615, we know that Joseph Huddleston was residing at Farrington Hall during that period. (Gillow, III, 463). We would expect, therefore to find that his son John had been brought up there; yet Sandford in his Responsa states that he was brought up at Hutton John and educated at a school at Blencow, not far from there. Now Hutton John was the residence of Andrew

Huddleston after he left Farrington some time later than 1612 (when he was convicted of recusancy there - Gillow, loc cit.). This is probably what gave Foley, or his informant, the idea that Sandford was Andrew's son. What really happened was probably something like this: when Andrew left Farrington (owing to Joseph's rapidly expanding family?) he took his nephew with him to live at Hutton John and sent him to be educated at the nearest free grammar school at Great Blencow. This will explain why later he will be the only one of his many uncles (except Fr. Richard) whom Huddleston will mention in his Obits. It also gives the reason for a strange remark in a letter of the French Ambassador to Louis XIV, describing the events which occurred at the deathbed of Charles II. There it is stated that Huddleston was "a Scottish priest" - a description which is quite unintelligible if he never lived further north than Lancashire, but is simply explained if he was the same as the John Sandford who had spent his formative years in the border vale of Dacre. Moreover, a careful reading of the Responsa confirms our hypothesis: "absolutis tunc temporis in ista schola humanioribus studiis, domum a parentibus revocatur" - which suggests that he has been living away from his parents all these years. The statement that his parents were "onerati" with children may then have been intended to explain why he had not been educated at home. One final confirmation comes from a handwritten note made by one Michael Lorymer in the copy of Richard Huddleston's "The Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church" which is now in the Rylands Library at Manchester. There "The Beauties of England and Wales" (n.p.d.) is quoted on the subject of Hutton John as saying: "We believe that a native of this village was the celebrated Catholic Father, John Huddleston, who became conspicuous for

his unshakeable loyalty to Charles II."

In spite of the weight of evidence in favour of the identification there remains one difficulty unsolved. It seems certain that John Huddleston was born in April, 1608. This is the date given by Jackson, using records preserved at Hutton John and by Burke's Landed Gentry for 1900, relying on a MS kept at York. The year is confirmed by a letter of the ambassador Rizzini to the Duke of Modena (Haile, Mary of Modena, p.119) stating that he was seventy-seven in 1685, and in the previously mentioned note of Lorymer where it is said that he was ninety-six in 1704. (Actually, Huddleston was dead then, but this does not necessarily invalidate the evidence as to his age!) A dated portrait at Hutton John bears further witness to this tradition, which is accepted by Gillow, the D.N.B. and Birt (correcting Snow, who gives it as 1609). It seems therefore impossible to doubt its accuracy. Yet Sandford, writing his Responsa on arrival at the College in Oct., 1632, says that he is "vigesimum secundum agens annum" which would more naturally mean that he was twenty-one, but when taken in conjunction with the "annos 22" of the Liber Ruber probably means that he was twenty-two, and was therefore born between October 1609 and October 1610. Now if he was the son of Joseph Huddleston, as he says he was, it is impossible that he should have been born then, since his brother Richard was born on 22nd March, 1610. (Jackson, loc cit.) (10). The only solution seems to be that he, or his parents, had forgotten his age at this period: extraordinary, indeed, even though he had been living away from his parents for so long, and even though his parents with their sixteen children may have been hard put to it to remember their various birthdays - but surely less unlikely than that he should

have forgotten his father's name! For that is the only other hypothesis; and unless we accept it we must henceforth consider John Huddleston and John Sandford as the same person. (11). It is with that presumption that we will continue with his biography.

After his Ordination in 1637 John stayed on for two full years at the English College, and it may well be that his good behaviour, which is commented on in the Liber Ruber, qualified him for the office of Prefect which Foley says he held in 1638. (v. 591). He left for England on 28 March, 1639, and seems to have taken up his duties as chaplain to the Prestons of Furness almost immediately. During his chaplaincy there he annotated his Missal with the dates of the deaths of many of the Preston family as well as of his own relatives. The fact that some of the dates are anterior to 1639 led Gillow to think that he had been chaplain there from 1637, but as he was in Rome at the time that would be impossible; and it is natural that a new chaplain taking up his position would note down the anniversaries of those who had died in the last couple of years and who presumably still had a prominent place in the family prayers. It seems probable that he owed this chaplaincy to the recommendation of his uncle, Richard Huddleston, to whom "the Prestons owed, next to God, their reconciliation" to the Faith (as John himself said, Introd. to "Short and Plain Way"). From his Obits it is clear that his chaplaincy extended also to the Ingleby family, who had also been converted by Uncle Richard. (ib. and C.R.S., I, 123 ff).

Shortly after Huddleston's return to England from Rome the country was torn by the Civil War, and many of the

Prestons and their relations fell in battle, their deaths being duly recorded in his Missal (C.R.S., loc cit.). His own family suffered, too. Some time after his father's death in 1644 the estate of Farrington was lost, and henceforth the family lived at Hutton John. Even that was not left untouched, and after the Restoration we find his two brothers, Andrew and William, petitioning the King for a grant because they had been fined by the rebels, their personal estate had been plundered and their real estate sold. (State papers, Chas. II,395). Snow's necrology preserves a tradition that John fought personally for the King; but since his missal proves him to have been at Furness during most of the Civil War this does not seem likely. Gillow (C.R.S. 20, 4) thinks he may have served as a chaplain, while Dom Roger Huddleston, with more plausibility, thinks that Snow (whose notice of four lines contains five errors) was confusing him with hi second cousin, John Huddleston of Millom Castle in Cumberland (C.E., VII, 511).

In 1645 Sir John Preston, first Baronet, and head of the family since his father's death in 1643, was killed as a result of an engagement with Parliamentary troops at Furness, and since his death is not recorded by Huddleston, it seems that he had left the family before that date. (CRS, 20, 4). It may have been at this period that he served as chaplain at Grove House, Wensleydale. (Barker, Three days of Wensleydale, 96). Possibly his connection with Wensleydale dated from the time when he lived in Yorkshire "pro beneplacito parentum" as he said in his Responsa.

By 1648, however, he had returned to Furness, for the

names of the Preston family begin to reappear in his Missal. He left there probably early in 1651 to become chaplain to the Whitgreaves of Moseley, Staffs, whither, he tells us, ("Short and Plain Way", note from the publisher) "Divine Providence had brought him not long before" King Charles II's stay there in September of that year.

It would be interesting to know whether he still preserved the alias of Sandford at this time. There is no trace of it in the various accounts of his protection of the King; but of course these were all written after the Restoration when he was in high favour at court and there was no need for subterfuge. Again, his relations are all entered in his Missal by their proper names, and aliases are only used for his priest friends; but this was a merely private document. On the other hand his manuscript on English Catholics up to 1649, which was probably written at about this date, must have born the name Sandford, since that is how Challoner refers to it. Probably he considered that, though there was no need to cover his identity among the faithful friends whose religious needs he served, it would be unwise to publish a full length history under his own name, a proceeding which might provoke reprisals.

As Huddleston himself said, "There are none so ignorant who have not heard of the defeat of His Late Majesty's army by the rebels at Worcester on the 3rd September 1651 and of the then preservation of his sacred life and person," so we will not waste time describing his part in those events. The story is told in full in readily accessible sources - Foley, v. 439-46 gives Huddleston's own account, and many documents are collected in Alan Fea's "The Flight of the King" - to which those interested may turn.

We know little of what happened to Huddleston during the Commonwealth period. When next he appears, in 1661, he is a Benedictine, and as there was no mention of this fact in the many documents dealing with the events in September, 1651, (12), it seems that he was professed in the meantime. Here again perhaps we may trace the influence of his uncle, Richard Huddleston, O.S.B.; if so, his profession must have taken place before the latter's death in 1655. Huddleston's obits during this period all refer to members of his own family and give us no clue as to where he was stationed; though perhaps it is significant that in 1657 he records the death of a Benedictine of Douay, Fr. Michael Gascoigne. (C.R.S. loc cit) (13).

After the Restoration he was received at Court, with others who had helped the King, and given a suitable reward; and so that he could live as a priest without hindrance he was given rooms at Somerset House, the palace of the Dowager Queen Henrietta Maria. (D.N.B. x 143). In 1661 he crossed to Douay for the thirteenth chapter of the English Benedictines, where he was elected titular Prior of Worcester (Weldon, 198). The C.R.S., 38, 2-29, records about fifty marriages at which Huddleston officiated at the chapel of St. James's between 1664 and 1671, and at the chapel of Somerset House, between 1671 and 1685. His signatures vary - "Huddleston" is the commonest, but there are about eleven variants including "Hurlston" and "Hodleston". He calls himself "Chaplain in Ordry to her Matie".

In 1666 he crossed to Douay, again to attend a chapter, and this time acted as its secretary (Weldon, loc cit.). He probably spent some time in France, as he is not recorded as having performed any marriages at all

in that year. Three years later Queen Henrietta died and he was made chaplain (Lorymer says confessor, though this is improbable) to Queen Catherine of Braganza, with a salary of 100 pounds besides a pension of a similar amount. In the same year Antony a Wood notes that he was living with Fr. Vincent Sadler O.S.B. in Amsterdam Court, Oxford. (Stapleton, Post-Reformation Catholic Missions in Oxfordshire, p. 15). In 1671, when Charles took his Queen on a progress through the West Country, Huddleston performed no less than 21 successive marriages during the early months of the year, so that it seems likely that he was the only chaplain left at Court. (C.R.S. 38, 2-29). In the summer, however, he was able to take a holiday, and again he went to Oxford with Sadler to attend the solemnity of the act. This time Antony a Wood was taken to his lodgings (on July 7) and asked the priest to tell him the story of the rescue of the King after the battle of Worcester. The antiquarian was so enthralled by the account that he made Huddleston promise to write it down for the benefit of posterity. (Wood, Life and Times, II, 225).

During the Titus Oates scare Huddleston was naturally in a privileged position. He was able to intercede with the King for the life of a fellow Benedictine, Ven. William Plessington, but his efforts were unsuccessful and Plessington was martyred on 12th July 1677. (Downside Review, 1886, p. 40). In 1678 the House of Lords ordered that a bill should be made exempting Huddleston, and others who had helped the King, from the penalties of the laws against recusants, and that "they should live as freely as any of His Majesty's Protestant subjects." (Catholicon, Dec. 1678). The passing of this bill is reported in the document given in 11th report Hist. MSS., App. ii, 93, where it is stated

that "the following persons (including Huddleston) who although Papists were yet very instrumental in the preservation of the King's person after the flight from Worcester and have thereby merited as a reward to be distinguished from others of their religion" are exempted from all acts against recusants except the Oath of Allegiance. Barillon, in his letter to Louis XIV, says that Huddleston had been exempted from all the acts made against priests, and he is followed by Burnet and Lorymer. In view of the evidence we have, such a statement seems justified, and when we find Macaulay (who is followed by Gillow and Roger Huddleston) saying that Barillon had made a mistake, we must remember that he had before him only the bill, given in the Lords' journal, and not the document published by the Hist. MSS. Commission.

The greatest moment of John Huddleston's life came when he was seventy-six, when he received the dying Charles II into the Church. Again the story is so well known that there is no need to retell it. The best account is in Barillon's letter, given in full by Turner in his life of James II, p226 ff. Huddleston's own description of the event can be found in Dodd, 3, 229. One point in Barillon's letter needs comment: he states that the Benedictine was "no great doctor" and needed to be instructed in how to behave himself before the King by one of the discalced Carmelite chaplains of the Marquis of Castel Melhor. This is the origin of Macaulay's famous remark that Huddleston was an "honest but illiterate monk." It is a strange statement when we consider that the old man had already written a manuscript on Catholics which was to win Challoner's commendation, and that he was shortly to publish a capable edition of his uncle's "Short and Plain

Way" with appendices of his own which reveal him as an adequate if garrulous historian. The facts seem to be that all his life he was fitted for quiet research, but apt to be flurried by any unexpected demand. Thus, in the first document we have from his hand, the Responsa, he shows a command of Latin which does credit to his schooling; but he cannot answer six simple questions without getting confused, (e.g. He omits his father's name; he says he is twenty-one when he means twenty-two and is in fact twenty-four; he makes that odd remark that his parents have only eleven children while he has three brothers and eight sisters, etc.) Similarly here: he is flustered by the sudden opportunity given him, but retains sufficient learning to understand a Portuguese Carmelite who knew no English!

After Charles' death Huddleston remained in Catherine of Braganza's household, and, according to Lorymer's note, was made superintendent of the chapel of Somerset House by James II. In 1688 he published a book with the title "The Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church, composed many years since by that eminent Divine, Mr. Richard Huddleston of the English Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict and now published for the Common Good by his Nephew, Mr. John Huddleston of the same Congregation. To which is annexed His Late Majesty King Charles II's papers found in his Closet after his decease as also a brief account of what occurred on his death bed with regard to religion." In a note of Introduction he explains how the book, when in manuscript, had caught the King's eye during the days when he was being sheltered at Moseley after the battle of Worcester. Charles read the book and told the delighted priest "I have not seen anything more plain and

clear on this subject. The arguments here drawn from Succession are so conclusive I do not see how they can be denied". Huddleston explains that he publishes the treatise in the hope that "this little book will have the same effect on others as it had on him." (14).

In spite of the Revolution of 1688 Huddleston's pension continued to be paid, and he resided at Somerset House until just before his death when his mind gave way and he was placed under the care of the Earl of Feversham, one of the two lords who had been present during the reconciliation of Charles II and who had been so impressed by what he saw that he had since become a Catholic. (C.E. VII, 511). His last days must have been saddened by the apostacy of his nephew Andrew, now head of the family, who played a prominent part in promoting the Revolution in Cumberland. That must be the reason why in his Will, which he made on the 30th January 1693, he speaks very coldly of Andrew and his son, and leaves them no more than a guinea each to buy a mourning ring. At last, in 1698, the old priest died at the age of ninety. The exact date of his death is not known, but it cannot have been on the 22nd September, 1698, as Snow states, still less in 1704, as Lorymer thought, because his Will was proved on the 12 Sept. 1698. (Jackson, 344). The next day he was buried at St. Mary le Strand. (C.E., loc cit.).

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

NOTES

(1) Gillow (C.R.S., 20, 4) erroneously gives the date as April 15. The correct date is found in Jackson, p338.

(2) Richard Huddleston, alias Parkinson, had to leave the College in 1606 owing to ill health, "Fuit facillimus ad regulas infringendas, sed visus est paulo ante discessum resipuisse et multis cum lacrimis veniam petere" says the Liber Ruber. The reform was permanent, for after his Ordination he did good work, becoming a Benedictine and reconciling many families to the Church. He was the author of an apologetic treatise, "The Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church" - cf. below.

(3) Fr. Charles Plowden lent it to one of the Commisioners engaged in dissolving the Bruges Colleges, and was unable to recover it. More recent searches in the Archives d'Etat in Brussels have proved vain. (Foley, 7, 378).

(4) He quotes Oliver's collections, s.v. Saundford. In the only copy of Oliver which I could reach, that in the Vatican Library, I could find no mention of Saundford.

(5) Foley himself admits that the fact that Sandford was a prefect in the College does not imply that he was a Jesuit (6,330).

(6) Among many proofs, the most convincing is his Missal, C.R.S. 1.

NOTES (Contd.)

(7) It may be interesting to give Foley's pedigree and compare it with the correct one given by Jackson and Burke.

Foley's pedigree: Andrew of Farrington = Mary of Hutton John

Andrew = A.B. Two sons Richard O.S.B.

Andrew. John (Sandford). John O.S.B.

The correct one: Andrew of Farrington = Mary of Hutton John

Joseph Dorothy Joyce John Edmond Bridget Byham William Andrew Rich

Mary Andrew Dorothy Jane John Richard Cuthbert Margaret Joyce etc.

(8) When John Sandford first came to the Venerabile he used the alias Josephson, and it is with this name that he signs his Responsa. Perhaps that is why he omitted his father's name. Such aliases were not popular at the College, and after 1632 he always uses "Sandford" which was derived from his grandmother's family. (R.Huddleston's Responsa).

(9) Burke's Landed Gentry gives the year of the marriage from the York MS. of the pedigree; but possibly Andrew only went to live at Hutton John after his father's death.

(10) The only alternative solution, that he was an illegitimate child, is ruled out not only by the words of the Responsa "parentes habet nobiles" but also the fact that he would have needed a dispensation for Orders, and would have had to state the fact in his answers.

(11) Actually the family do seem to have been a little vague on birthdays and genealogical details. Uncle Richard, when he came to the College, said that he thought he was nearly nineteen, when in fact he had not turned eighteen; and gave the number of his brothers as three instead of six.

(12) Except in Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, which is so inaccurate in dealing with this period that his evidence proves no more than that Huddleston was a Benedictine when Clarendon knew him after the Restoration.

(13) Michael Lorymer, quoting the "Beauties of England and Wales", says that he followed Charles in disguise to the Continent, but this picturesque detail is not mentioned in Huddleston's own account of his services to the King.

(14) Another book has sometimes been attributed to him, but without evidence. This is "Eikon Basilika Deutera: The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty King Charles II with his reasons for turning Roman Catholic, found in his strong box, together with Portrait of His Majesty at prayer." Published 1694. It also contains a reprint of Huddleston's account of his administering Viaticum to the King. The strong box papers have caused much controversy which does not concern us here.

FATHER THOMAS WRIGHT: A TEST CASE FOR TOLERATION

Theodore A. Stroud

The struggle of the English Catholics during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I to achieve toleration has already proved itself a challenging feature of Renaissance culture. It is surprising, therefore, that few of the personalities in this conflict have been studied in detail, especially the Catholic leaders who facilitated rather than resisted the submission of the Catholic population to the government. Perhaps a study of these men, who were subject to correction by the forces at either extreme, would lend to our comprehension of the period a degree of objectivity not to be found among the deluge of partisan accounts. At least their careers can complement, as biography always does history, the existing surveys (1), giving them continuity and human significance.

Although there are far more prominent subjects for biography than Father Thomas Wright, I submit that his career is a microcosm of the politico-religious issues of the period. He appears, though never as a central figure, in almost every major scene of the conflict. He devoted his life to moulding Church policy, frequently without the permission or approval of his superiors, and once apparently affected English policy. Yet the details of his life are obscure and difficult to disentangle from those of his relatives (2): even though he has been quoted as leading a growing faction among the English Catholics (3), the historians in question failed to identify him.

The son of an ardent Roman Catholic family in York, Thomas was born in 1561, at a time when widespread resentment against the Church of England was soon to culminate in

the revolt of 1569. When it was suppressed, in such a sanguinary fashion as to deter others, the boy was mature enough to share the feelings of his family and partly to realize the price his convictions would exact. Upon attaining his majority, he promptly fled to the continent, arriving at Douais Seminary in July, 1577 (4). There he matriculated in the school to which most Catholic youths were directed if they sought to dedicate themselves to the English Mission.

Any search for influences which led him to dedicate his life to the priesthood naturally begins with his father's convictions. An outstanding recusant (5), the father undoubtedly contributed to the decisions of two of his sons to become priests. But another relative, Dr.John Wright, may have been the primary stimulus. This Marian priest, probably the boys' uncle, returned to England and to Yorkshire the very year that Thomas fled to the continent (6). About a year later, his younger brother also escaped across the Channel to enter the priesthood. During that period their uncle was in a York prison, and it is reasonable to suppose that the priest inspired his nephews to emulate his career, in the hope that they might supplement his efforts.

The next spring (1578) Wright left for Rome, where he enrolled in the newly established English College (7), and was still there in 1579 for the initial administering of the Mission Oath, which pledged the students to enter upon the English Mission whenever their superiors felt that the times were auspicious. Young Wright was not among the ring-leaders who carried their grievance to a sympathetic Cardinal, with the result that the college came under Jesuit

control coincidentally with the appointment of a rector favorable to the English students (8). Soon Wright was to make his presence felt, however, and in a situation which eventually had repercussions among the priesthood in England. The insurrection of the English students was barely history when the insistence of Thomas Wright and John Barton that they be permitted to join the Society again embroiled the students and the faculty (9). The Jesuit order was not being permitted to send its members to serve in the English Mission. The other students accused anyone who sought to join the Society of breaking his formal oath. They protested that their Jesuit teachers were indoctrinating the exceptional students with the desire of becoming Jesuits. If their contention was correct, Wright had strayed from his initial resolution to serve his countrymen as the Church directed. The extent of his deviation, however, cannot be ascertained, since he may have known that the Jesuits were momentarily expecting permission to send missionaries to England. After an official conciliator had vainly sought to dissuade Wright and Barton from their request, he promised that no more students would be admitted to the Society without the Cardinal Protector's express permission (10). Whatever the modification in Wright's plans, in effect his decision was to make his return to England impossible as long as he remained in the Order.

Once having made his choice, Wright saw definite advantages in entering upon his vocation immediately (11). On February 3, 1580, Wright was admitted and began his two-year retreat (11a). A year later Thomas' brother William came to Rome where he enrolled in the English College and sought admission to the Society. Soon after he was accepted, the first student since Thomas entered twenty months before

(12), Thomas took the "simple" vows binding him absolutely to the Society and left for Milan.

At the end of four years, on September 20, 1586, Wright completed his training in theology and Hebrew and was ordained (13). With a short period as public professor of Hebrew at Milan he began his contribution to the Society as an academician. For the next nine years he taught in schools all over the continent (14). His positions are rather obscure in 1594 he is reported as the praefectus studiorum of the new seminary established by F. Persons in Valladolid, Spain (15).

One might suppose that his career had rigidified, but actually there was increasing friction between Wright and the Society. According to the Jesuits, wherever he was stationed -- Italy, Belgium, or Spain -- he fomented trouble within their ranks (16). Wright, in turn, regretted his being deprived of the English Mission and insisted that he be allowed to return to England as a Jesuit. The frequency with which he changed positions may be attributed either to his dissatisfaction or to patient attempts by the Society to suit his temperament. It is said that General Aquaviva, the head of the Order, flatly refused his plea (17). Aquaviva's attitude is no surprise, especially if Wright was already insisting on a novel approach to the English Mission. Father Persons, who more than once showed a warm regard for Wright, tried unsuccessfully to reconcile him. Thus a break became inevitable.

Finally, because of "extravagant propositions" which Wright set forth while he was teaching in Belgium, the General decided to expel him from the Society. But the

appeals of "certain English Jesuits" to Persons led him to intercede for Wright (18), who was then given a chance to redeem himself in Persons' new seminary. When Wright arrived there in 1594, Persons assigned him to the teaching of "Controversies" (19). Later, Persons is said to have apologized to the General for his unwarranted intervention, explaining that he had lacked complete information about the circumstances underlying the General's decision (20).

Wright no longer seems to vacillate between two goals: missionary work in England or an academic career on the continent. Now his concern was with the various policies for aiding his Catholic countrymen. When he sought to return to England as a Jesuit, obedience to his superiors would seemingly have required that he support the Jesuits on political issues, especially to promote the Spanish king's efforts to supplant Queen Elizabeth. To prove that this course became morally impossible for Wright, one must follow his later career. But other evidence is at hand: an unpublished tract (21) which may well be a culmination of the "extravagant propositions" referred to by Aquaviva. The tract has not heretofore been attributed to Thomas Wright, but rather to Dr. John Wright, on the basis of a note in Lord Burghley's handwriting on the copy found among his papers (22). Since the memorandum merely states that "Wright, a priest" was the author of the Latin tract, however, this conclusion should be challenged. The arguments used in the tract are totally incompatible with the activities of John Wright, who was soon to become the Dean of Courtrai, directly under Spanish control, and to remain in that position for the rest of his life. So far as can be discovered, he consistently aligned himself with the Spanish faction (23). In contrast, Father Thomas Wright soon broke with the Society, joined the English Mission, and became an informer against Philip II of Spain.

Moreover, the theories of toleration expressed in the tract are manifestly similar to those which underlie Thomas' actions in subsequent years.

In the tract he insists that "the queen and kingdom of England have suffered very many, and those very grievous wrongs from the king of Spain," that King Philip is only pretending an interest in the English Catholics, and that even the Pope is wrong if he persists in sponsoring Spanish invasions of England (24). Wright contends that the sufferings of the English Catholics would not be lessened by a successful invasion, but greatly increased by a failure. Instead, the Catholic authorities should promote a consistent policy of submission to the Crown and of loyal opposition to any threat of outside domination, which alone would produce the desired relief and result in all English Catholics being allowed "liberty of conscience" (25). He feels that this may happen even during the reign of Queen Elizabeth: "She has already granted (toleration) to some; because she very well hath known them to be good subjects." At least, whoever "succeedeth her shall certainly be a Catholic, or will permit us to live catholicly..." (26). More astute is his prediction that the Anglican Church must in time align itself with the Catholics in order to counterbalance the threatening surge of Puritanism. As a matter of fact, the whole tract argues for a position which certain modern Catholic historians consider the only realistic one (27).

Undoubtedly such a tract, if it came into the hands of the Society, must have offended his superiors; he challenged the authority of the Pope over a matter pertaining to the "universal church" and censures a project to which Cardinal Allen devoted the last years of his life. In the

words of one Catholic historian, "Wright, a priest. . . at Douay, maintained the contrary doctrine in the most explicit terms, and supported by the boldest arguments" (28). The tract has served more than once as an example of the opposition to the Roman Catholic plans for England by refugees who were forced to depend on the bounty of King Philip even as they rejected his grandiose schemes of conquest (29).

It is interesting to speculate concerning the circumstances and motivation of his tract. Was he under the impression that expulsion from the Society would further his desire to return to England and to put his theories concerning toleration into effect? Particularly, did he use the tract to insure a cordial reception upon his arrival in England? When one recalls that a copy of the tract was found among the papers of Burghley and that he was expecting Wright to ask him rather than Essex for protection (30), such an inference is not too improbable.

But other influences determined the exact procedure by which Wright was to achieve personal toleration, if only temporarily. An Englishman "then acting as a spy at Fontarabia," showed him friendly letters from the Earl of Essex (31), under whose proection two Catholic laymen were known to be prospering. Reports of their "liberty of conscience" must have led the refugees to question the necessity for enduring homesickness and deprivation in Spain (32). One of Essex's subordinates may well have suggested that Wright enter England, not secretly like all other priests, but openly, under the protection of the Earl -- a veritable test case.

Early in 1595 Wright insisted that he be released from the Society for two years while he disproved Aquaviva's judgment that he was unfitted for the exigencies of the English Mission, and met with a point-blank refusal. As a secular priest, Wright was readily granted his petition to return. According to one report, it was publicly given out that Wright "was appointed by his superiors to come into England and to win souls to the Rhomish religion, a thing which he did undertake willingly as a thing he had desired long before" (33). The fact that Wright's method of embarking upon the mission was the first of its kind gives it some historical significance.

He was convinced that he could relieve the English Catholics of persecution where the ablest minds of the Church had patently failed. But first he would gain personal toleration. He concealed his identity only until he arrived in the London port (June, 1595), where he surrendered his person to Anthony Bacon, the confidential secretary of the Earl of Essex (34). The priest was questioned at least twice by the officials, but rather perfunctorily. The weight of Essex' favor, his insistance that patriotism drove him to return, and perhaps the evidence of the tract gained his freedom. In the examinations, however, he said nothing that reflected upon the Catholic cause as he conceived it, selecting his details to defend the English Catholics against any charges of disloyalty (35). The most meaningful interpretation of his actions for the next few years depends upon the hypothesis that Wright was convinced that his policy was correct, and to insure its success was willing to oppose the present policies of the Church with every means at his disposal.

Apparently he had profited by Essex' advice to his spy at Fontarabia that he should not "return to England, unless he should come furnished with some most important and extraordinary advertisements to content her majesty" (36). For once seated at Essex' table, Wright promptly supplied an "intelligence of all King Philip's practices," particularly that "the King made promises to come with an army next spring (1596)" (37). It is ironical that the very news which made him welcome also committed him to the struggle between Essex and Secretary Cecil to control the government of England, and thereby occasioned the frustration of his plans to secure toleration. Thus when Essex presented these details of Spanish military preparations to the Coucil, Cecil immediately decried Wright's testimony (38).

The failure of his experiment, however, did not come about in this fashion. Wright's report was soon corroborated and Essex was privileged to expose Cecil's bias. The Earl took the same opportunity to tell the Queen that the priest was "as good a subject as any she had, and should have the liberty of his conscience, which was all he had demanded" (39). As compensation she permitted the priest to visit his native city of York. The trip may have convinced Wright that his approach was unassailable, since it was a privilege hardly to be dreamed of by other priest. But Wright was incapable of sustaining his status; perhaps no one could have withstood both the intense distrust of his religious antagonists and Cecil's enmity, which was in direct proportion to Wright's usefulness to Essex. Dizzy with success, Wright openly argued with the Anglican authorities at York on the most dangerous grounds. The archbishop immediately wrote the Coucil, protesting their sponsoring a priest who, in the Archbishop's

presence, defended the moral right of any subject to kill a tyrant; "And God knows, whether he hath not dispensation to betray some things against the Spaniards that some other way he may do the Pope a better service" (40). Yet the Archbishop admitted to Essex that Wright, though not profoundly learned, seemed "skillful and ready in most points now in controversy." Essex should "persuade him to confer with learned men....He seemed to be of good nature; and after admonition given by me he became more circumspect in reasoning." In evaluating the cause of his failure, one cannot take the Archbishop's judgment at its face value, since he was the Anglican official reacting to an effective Roman Catholic polemist (41).

In defending the priest against all complaints, Anthony Bacon stated that Essex expected, by this medium, to receive "daily advertisements out of Spain" (42). But Wright's value as a spy could not long protect him from the charges of his foes. After his return from York, he again became a guest of Essex, moving in a circle which included Anthony and Francis Bacon, Antonio Perez (former secretary to the King of Spain), Lord Mountjoy (43), and the Earls of Rutland and Southampton. Only a few more days of freedom, however, remained to Wright before Cecil was to command "his restraint in her Majesty's name." Essex carried out the order by requesting the Dean of Westminster to receive him as an honorary prisoner (44).

Wright was to spend the next two or three years in futile efforts to retrieve the status of his initial success. Only with great difficulty was he convinced that his reverse was permanent. Soon after his confinement he wrote Father Henry Garnet, leader of the Jesuits on the English Mission:

> ....as for my part, because her majesty understandeth that I pretendeth nothing in England but religion, I have found that favor which perhaps none hath obtained hitherto; which is, that none shall trouble me, for my conscience; and so I think many more should obtain, if they proceeded in the same manner. (45).

Perhaps Wright's fear that the letter would be intercepted dictated his optimistic claim, certainly he did not want to confirm the Jesuits' opinion that his experiment was collapsing. And if it did, Wright sought to shift the blame. When he first arrived in England, he confidently pointed to a recent decree that Jesuits were "not to deal in any matters concerning the State." Hardly a year later he was appealing to Garnet to prevent frequent violations of the decree. By this means, Wright was able to imply that his labors for toleration were endangered only by the crimes of the Spanish faction among the Jesuits.

Anthony Bacon was untiring in his efforts to free Wright, and his brother Francis interceded at least twice in Wright's behalf, once with the Queen and again with Cecil (46). Wright frequently appealed to Essex and Cecil, often stressing his physical discomforts. Meanwhile he continued assiduously to court the Earl's favor. But he eventually became aware of his vulnerable position; in his own words he had become "the football of suspicions in matters concerning religion" (47). He considered his lot more insupportable than that of an ordinary prisoner, who at least could converse with other Catholics and occasionally resort to bribes.

Early in 1596 Essex asked Wright to return to the continent as a spy, but met with a refusal, mingling

indignation and caution. Since the Earl apparently could or would no longer help him, he concluded the letter:

> I could desire with all my heart her majesty would give me leave to go into France, for I am almost for her sake banished out of Spain, Italy, and Flanders. Yet I had rather suffer any disaster in another country than tolerate this ingratitude in mine own. I lived well nigh twenty years abroad only my allegiance brought me in; and seeing I am so acquitted I would be content rather to be buried in a monastery than see such strange dealing at home. (48).

Wright continued to make Essex "acquainted with those things which he judged in any case to concern the good and conservation of her majesty and her kingdom (49), until Cecil found a convenient pretext to eliminate him as a source of information for the Earl. The priest, in carrying out his instructions to discuss matters of religion with the ministers at the Dean's house, had become acquainted with a promising young poet and Anglican divine, Dr. William Alabaster, who chose that particular time to embrace Catholicism. Perhaps he was actually influenced by Wright, who claimed that he was taunted by the others into frequent debates with Alabaster. Even the Jesuits, with their efficient sources of information, thought that Wright had actually converted him (50).

Wright's confinement (in Sept., 1597) dealt a paralyzing blow to his hopes. The year before, in an exchange of letters with F. Garnet, Wright had denied the report that he had told of leaving the Society because of

"grievous disorders"; he assured Garnet that he had left the Society "not for that it did not deserve him, but because he did not deserve so holy a company, not having that health which such continual and heavenly exercises required." Now in Gatehead Prison, and later in Bridewell, he renewed his contacts with Jesuits, including Garnet. To him Wright even spoke of re-entering the Society (51), although a return would be a confession that his plans for personal toleration had failed. Either he desperately needed help, or Essex' opportunistic appeals to various groups for support suggested to Wright that he try to sway the Jesuits to the support of Essex (52). But the negotiations broke off, and Wright finally regained confidence in his original policies.

Even in prison, he was an active propagandist. Among his first efforts was a polemical tract glorifying the Blessed Sacrament (53). An immediate result of its publication was his stricter confinement in Bridewell. It was not long, however, until he saw a way to use his talents in proving his loyalty to the government and his patriotic desire to improve his fellow countrymen. In October, 1598, he wrote to Bacon explaining that he had just completed "a book of the passions of the mind." The manuscript had been given to the Bishop of London with the assurance that it contained nothing "either against this state or present religion" (54). Of the six works which Wright is said to have produced during his eight years of imprisonment, this was his only conciliatory gesture toward the government.

He must have felt that his personal liberty was unconditionally dependent upon the success of the Earl's

ambitions. In the winter of 1598 he opposed an attempt to move him to Wisbeach, a prison some distance from London, probably because he feared to leave the sphere in which he was conscious of Essex' influence. Instead Wright was transferred to the Clink, the London prison where secular priests were often kept (55). Meanwhile, the increasing risks which Essex took in quarreling with the Queen must have upset Wright. Perhaps in desperation, he advanced an alternative course of action for Essex. The day before the Earl left on his ill-fated venture in Ireland (March, 1599) Wright reportedly was summoned to Essex' house to discuss possible developments. The priest succeeded in convincing the Earl that the Catholics had never hated him, much less plotted to poison him. Wright offered to go with him to Ireland to "help him know his friends from his enemies" (56). There is also a report that he persuaded Essex to seek the Pope's blessing. If a record of what Wright said during Essex' trial is true, the priest had approved the Earl's policy of concealing his actual religious beliefs in order to attract support from all quarters, and had urged Essex to obtain the throne for himself (57).

Wright eventually recognized that the Earl had irretrievably lost his power in court. Cecil's control of English policy was conceded everywhere. His servitors made it almost impossible for Wright to send Essex a letter, much less obtain a release. Slowly the priest began to hedge against the dissolution of his policy. When he was actually transferred to Wisbeach Prison (February, 1600) he risked his life by escaping (58), and spent his weeks of freedom in writing and disseminating a polemic against Protestantism (59)

The final scene of this major act in Wright's career was played as an interlude to Essex' sensational rebellion and trial. When the Earl returned from Ireland against the Queen's orders, after a disappointing campaign, Cecil immediately sensed his opportunity. Upon Wright's recapture, on June 13, 1600, he was put in the Tower and examined about his connections with Essex (60). Cecil apparently realized that the priest was the most obvious link between Essex and the Catholics, especially in support of the allegation that Essex had talked privately with Tyrone, the leader of the Irish rebels, about Catholic support. Probably only the Queen's unwillingness to act prevented Wright's being employed to convict Essex to treason. Finally, in desperation, Essex resolved to gamble everything on an insurrection.

Success for Essex would have meant vindication for Wright and perhaps some degree of general toleration for the Catholics. The failure of his revolt, however, seemed to revive in Wright the memory of long months of agonizing waiting for Essex to intercede for him. Moreover, any gratitude which he felt was not to interfere with his new goal -- namely, to ingratiate himself with the Cecil faction. When the opportunity came, therefore, Wright is credited with statements which were patently harmful to Essex (61). As it happened, the case against Essex was so strong that Wright's evidence was not needed especially as the prosecutors soon found that the Earl could use any specific charges to lead the trial into endless irrelevancies. It is worth noting, however, that the report of the charges, in a letter written by the French ambassador, bears a marked resemblance to several points in Wright's revelations (62).

When Wright finally abandoned the idea of setting a personal example for the English clergy, and decided to work primarily for general amelioration, he quite naturally gravitated into the camp of the Appellants (63). From the first he had shared their loyalty to the Crown. Since he was thus in fundamental agreement with the emerging privileged faction and yet suffered from Cecil's desire to eliminate any tool of his rival, Wright's comparative immunity as a protegee of Essex had from the first been an anomaly. It was not until 1599, when Wright was transferred to the Clink (a focal point for the Appellant group), that he allied himself with the secular priests. The Jesuit reaction is probably reflected in the charge (c. 1600) by William Watson, the most intemperate of the Appellants, that the Jesuits had circulated reports among the Catholics (" as sent from the fathers") that Wright's opinions were of little consequence. Watson retorted that "to their shame he hath proved better than anie of them as yet have proved; and farre better since he hath consorted himself to live as other priests doe, then when at first he had a smacke of their singularitie in his proceedings..." (64). Wright did not join in their public attacks on the Society, however, until long after the death of Essex.

The summer of 1601 saw a large number of priests transferred to Framlingham prison, some eighty-five miles from London. Wright was specifically exempted from the transfer because of "some information by the Lieutenant of the Tower" (65). From the letters he wrote the Bishop of London begging to be released from prison, one might suppose it was a penalty. Yet a few weeks later the Bishop obtained permission from Cecil to move Wright from the Tower to the Clink in return for special services promised

by the priest, and later unsuccessfully requested his release (66). Apparently, however, Wright did obtain the privilege of going "into London at his pleasure." Thus within eighteen months after Essex' execution, he had so successfully identified himself with the anti-Jesuit faction that he rivaled the Bishop of London's favorites in prison liberties.

But Wright's prospects for freedom, even on this make-shift basis, were again illusory. He gambled on the hope that being transferred to the Clink would afford him certain religious privileges. Cecil was aware of his intentions and threatened to return him to the Tower if Wright kept "open house in ye Clink" (67). His hopes that the Appellant movement had some assurance of success were also thwarted in the months before Queen Elizabeth's death. In her fear that the Roman Catholics would interfere with the succession to the throne, she disrupted Cecil's "divide and rule" policy and instituted banishment proceedings against all the priests then in prison (68). Cecil was able to protect a small group of Appellants who had been loyally serving him and who drew up an oath of allegiance to the Queen, but Wright and forty other priests were banished (69) after the accession of King James I, who took it on himself to execute the decision postponed by the illness and death of Queen Elizabeth.

Wright went immediately to Douais and then to see his relative, Dr. John Wright, Dean of Courtrai (70). Two months later (August, 1603), he journeyed secretly back to London, leading a party of eight Catholic priests, all of whom were as convinced as he that the new King was going to grant toleration to the English Catholics (71).

They had, after all, received King James' own word that he would favor the Roman Catholic Church (72), and were acting accordingly. The two factions were temporarily united, neither daring to endanger the hope of toleration. Cecil continued his plans to weaken the Catholic element, although his role in promoting a conspiracy against the throne is obscure (73). In a desperate attempt to avoid being stigmatized by the conspiracy, both the Jesuits and the Appellants informed the English authorities of this plot (74). One of the first moves that Wright made after his return to England was to "advise all men to take heed of meddling either with Watson or Clark," who were the principals in that conspiracy (75). Wright also began to exchange frequent messages with the Archpriest, who has already been mentioned as a Jesuit sympathizer (76). This connection is another sign of the temporary unity and may have been the beginning of the Archpriest's break with the Jesuits when the next crisis arose.

Little is known of what Wright was doing until after the next crisis. For some months he remained concealed but as it became increasingly apparent that toleration was not automatically forthcoming, Wright was forced to reconsider his position. For Cecil continued to incite disturbances which would alienate any sympathy which the King may have retained for the Catholics (77). With a viciousness born of frustration and desperation at having been deceived (according to a plausible interpretation), a few Catholics hit upon the Gunpowder Plot and gave Cecil the perfect climax to his campaign. Afterwards, truly the only hope for the English Catholics was to throw themselves on the mercy of the Government.

The next period of Wright's life was devoted to convincing the Catholic laity that such a submission was necessary. Even before the English government made it feasible for the Catholics to certify their loyalty, Wright was preaching that they were not violating the tenets of their faith if they went to the Anglican churches in order to hear the sermons: that is, the Pope's interdict against taking the Anglican sacrament which accompanied these sermons could safely be violated by a technicality. Early in 1606, King James offered amnesty to those Catholics who would publicly take the Oath of Allegiance. The Jesuits immediately argued, and with some reason, that the Oath violated their allegiance to the Pope. In supporting the legitimacy of the Oath, Wright was called the leader of a priestly faction whose success amazed the Jesuits: "Whole counties and Shies run headlong without struggle into the heretics' churches" (78). And though many of the secular priests were shocked, Wright and a few of the Appellants did not hesitate publicly to make plans with Cecil, now Earl of Salisbury, for the defense of the Oath (79). English Jesuits wrote bitter diatribes against Wright to Father Persons desiring him to supply information against Wright especially to prove his unreliability (80). Wright and William Bishop, to name only two, were probably among the Catholic priests who helped persuade the Archpriest to issue an official approval of the Oath. But it is only natural that histories of this event have ignored Wright and placed the responsibility for the mass movement of the Catholic laity directly upon the Archpriest, whose defection was widely criticised by continental Catholics.

That same winter (1606-7) Thomas' brother, Father William Wright, came to London and temporarily revived

Catholic resistance. By spring, however, the Government had imprisoned him and minimized his effectiveness. No longer able to exert a personal influence on the English Catholics, he wrote and circulated a tract attacking those members of the clergy who supported the Oath. Perhaps it is to this tract that Thomas Wright published an answer (81), and to it Father Persons himself chose to reply publicly. Persons' work may have been useful to the English Jesuits, but it is said that he treated Thomas Wright very mildly, attributing his error to a pardonable excess of sympathy for his flock's wretchedness (82). This unusual forbearance on the part of Persons may be attributed to a current strategy of conciliation, or (as I prefer to believe) to a personal friendship and respect impervious to any charges. Thus Persons must not have believed the report that Wright "vaunteth and braggeth that he will defend it (his position) before the Pope, and would fain be summoned to that bar to show what he can say for himself" (83).

For three more years Wright continued to defend "the lawfulness of going to the churches of the heretics" with noticeable success (84). His cooperation with the English authorities seems to have included one or more trips to France and Flanders, from which he returned safely to England. But his fortunes continued to be at the mercy of historical events. When in 1610 the Parliament received the news that Ravaillac had assassinated Henry IV of France at the instigation of a Jesuit, it responded by enforcing its crushing legislation against the Catholics (85). Wright joined the exodus of Catholic priests, probably convinced that his long years of cooperation and concessions to the Government had proved fruitless. The Jesuits reported that he dared not go to Rome even though he sought to support the agitation "for the foundation of a College of

Writers against the heretics" (86). If this report is correct, he may have spent part of the next decade at the quarters of the College d'Arras, which sponsored this institution after its inception in 1611.

With Wright's departure from England, his activities lose their value for illuminating this struggle for religious autonomy, if indeed his movements can be identified at all (87). But for twenty crucial years his career exhibits the reactions which underlay his co-workers' decisions to assist the English authorities in gaining control of the Catholic population. If such men were misled, it was not merely a factional blindness: the Appellants' bitterness against Jesuit policy has too often been employed to account for their forthright collaboration, for instance, with the Earl of Salisbury. Perhaps Wright is the clearest example of a priest who, though far removed from the intense factionalism of the English scene, arrived fundamentally at the same conclusions as many of the secular priests. But for the combined efforts of these priests, the Catholic Church might well have been in a position to recover its power and prestige when the fear of Puritanism was later to paralyze the Church of England. How large Wright's contribution to thwarting this outcome was I leave to the opinion of the reader.

In 1623 James I agreed to countenance the presence of a Catholic Bishop in England. Appointed then as Vicar Apostolic of England was the former Appellant, William Bishop, who in turn included a Thomas Wright among the nineteen canons whose task it was to rehabilitate the Church hierarchy in England (88). Wright lived only a few months after his appointment, not even long enough to witness any

more reverses. It seems eminently fitting that he should return to England to spend the final months of his life as tangible evidence of the triumph of the policies which he had zealously and persistently advocated.

NOTES

1) e.g. W. K. Jordan, The development of Religious Toleration in England (New York, 1932-39); A. O. Meyer, England und die Katholische Kirche unter Elizabeth (Rome, 1911).

2) Charles Dodd, pseud., The Church History of England from the Beginnings to 1688 (Brussels, 1737-42) II, 384, notes that we have "two accounts of him, which cannot easily be reconciled." D.N.B. suffers from the same confusion; in fact it goes further and carefully distinguishes the author of The Passions of the Mind in Generall (1601) who is actually our subject, from the Catholic divine.

3) J.B. Black, The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603 (Oxford, 1936), p.373; Edward Nares, Memoirs of ... William Cecil, Lord Burghley (London, 1831), III, 454.

4) Henry Foley, S.J., The Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus (London, 1877-83), VII, 1446; T. F. Knox, ed., Records of English Catholics under the Penal Law (London, 1878), I, 124.

NOTES (Contd.)

5) Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Salisbury MSS., IV, 216-17; John Strype, Annals of the Reformation (Oxford, 1820-40), Part Three, IV, 305.

6) Knox, I, 124.

7) Publications of the Catholic Record Society, II, 133; IX, 17; XXXVII, 9, 11.
Foley, VI, 132, 134-35; Knox, I, 143.

8) Knox, II, 97-160.

9) Leo Hicks, S.J., "The English College, Rome, and the Vocations to the Society of Jesus, March 1579 - July 1595", Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu, III (1934), 7.

10) T. F. Knox, ed., Letters of Allen (London, 1885), p.451.

11) Since joining the Order meant that he must interrupt his studies in order to serve a two-year probationary novitiate, he felt that the interruption would be less serious at this point, when he had just completed his two years in philosophy, and had yet to begin his four-year training in theology, than at any other time.

11a) C.R.S., IX, 23; XXXVII, 7, 11; Foley, VII, 1560.

12) Foley, II, 267; Meyer, p. 420.

13) Foley, VII, 1460.

NOTES (Contd.)

14) C.R.S., XIV, 21; Foley, VII, 1460; John Morris, S. J., The Troubles of Our Catholic Ancestors, 3rd. ser. (London, 1871), I, 287.

15) H. M. C., Salisbury MSS, VI, 421-22: Pitzeus, p. 812.

16) Information furnished me by Leo Hicks, S. J., based on "documents in the Jesuit archives."

17) Information furnished me by Leo Hicks, S. J.

18) Ibid.

19) Joannes Pitzeus, Relationum Historicarum (Parisiis, 1619), p. 812.

20) Information furnished me by Leo Hicks, S. J.

21) Strype, Part Three, II, 83. A reference to the trial of Lopez establishes the earliest date as the spring of 1594.

22) Nares, III, 454, argues that it could not have been our Wright because he was a Jesuit.

23) E.g., Thomas Law, The Archpriest Controversy (London 1896), I, 135-36.

24) Strype, Part Three, II, 585-86.

25) Ibid., pp. 589-91.

NOTES (Contd.)

26) Ibid., pp. 592-93.

27) Peter Guilday, The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795 (New York, 1914), p. 94; J. H. Pollen, "Politics of the English Catholics during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth," Month, XCIX (1902), 583.

28) Charles Butler, Historical Memoirs respecting the English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics from the Reformation (London, 1822), II, 8.

29) Nares, III, 454; Black, p. 373.

30) Thomas Birch, Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (London, 1754), II, 129.

31) Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1598-1601 (London, 1860), p. 568.

32) Ibid., 1595-97, p. 145; Guilday, p. 93; Jordan, I, 406-7.

33) H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., VI, 431-32.

34) Birch, I, 252.

35) C. S. P. Dom., 1595-97, pp. 59 and 156.

36) Birch, I, 183-84.

37) H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., VI, 283-84.

NOTES (Contd.)

38) Birch, I, 308-9.

39) C. S. P. Dom., 1598-1601, pp. 216-17.

40) Strype, Part Three, II, 305-6.

41) Seven years later this visit was still being referred to as a serious blow to Anglican efforts in the area (H. M. C., Salisbury MSS, XII, 177.)

42) Birch, I, 309. For further details about Wright's reputation for loyalty, cf. T. A. Stroud, "Ben Jonson and Father Thomas Wright," ELH, XIV (1947), 277-79.

43) For his offer to intercede for Wright, cf. H. M. C. Salisbury MSS., VIII, 449.

44) Birch, I, 307; II, 151.

45) Ibid., I, 359-60.

46) Birch, II, 70-2.

47) H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., VIII, 394.

48) Birch, II, 71-2.

49) Ibid., pp. 179-80; Cf. p. 187 for an illustration.

50) John Pollen, S. J., "William Alabaster, a Newly Discovered Catholic Poet of the Elizabethan Age," Month, CII (1904),

NOTES (Contd.)

427. During the few weeks while the poet concealed his defection, he and Wright are said to have collaborated on a "tragedy against the Church of England," but no record of it exists (H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., VII, 394.)

51) C. S. P., Dom., 1598-1601, p. 10; John Gerard, "Contributions toward a Life of Father Henry Garnet, S. J.," Month, XCI (1898), 366.

52) According to Hicks, p. 23 fn., the Society refused to re-admit Wright because he was implicated in the rebellion of Essex. Since it had to make the decision, however, long before that revolt took place, the report may mean that he was too persistent in calling the Earl to the Jesuits' attention at the time he was being considered.

53) Gerard, p. 366; Pitzeus, p. 813.

54) H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., VIII, 395. This work has recently become significant as a source book for Elizabethan psychology.

55) Ibid., p. 449.

56) C. S. P., Dom., 1598-1601, pp. 455-56; the information furnished by Father Hicks also includes a parallel quotation from Bibl. Vat. Lat. 6227 f. 113.

57) Ibid., pp. 568-69.

NOTES (Contd.)

58) C. S. P., Dom., 1598-1601, p., 456; Gerard (p. 463) describes the execution of two other priests who escaped that spring.

59) Pitzeus, p. 813; Pollard and Redgrave, Short Title Catalogue, item 2318, pseudonym H.T. (For recapture under the alias Thorpe cf. H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., X, 256.)

60) C. S. P. Dom., 1598-1601, pp. 442, 455-56.

61) C. S. P. Dom., 1598-1601, pp. 568-69.

62) C. C. Stopes, The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton Shakespeare's Patron (Cambridge, 1922), p. 216.

63) This label was given to a number of outspoken secular priests who proclaimed their loyalty to the English throne and fulminated against the Jesuits for openly counseling rebellion (See Wright's letter to Garnet in 1596 for similar charges.) The secular priests argued, with some reason, that the suffering of the English laity was largely due to this traitorous faction, but in doing so they unwillingly assisted the government in its campaign to split the English Catholics. During the years 1597-1603, Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, skillfully fostered this friction between the various elements of the Catholic clergy (William Barlow, The Summe and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court (London, 1604), p. 50). When in 1598 the Pope appointed an Archpriest friendly to the Jesuits (and thus objectionable to the secular

NOTES (Contd.)

priests), Bancroft was able to capitalize on their discontent in order to bring about a sharp break between the two factions. To the more outspoken among the seculars he granted the privileges of publication, of merely nominal imprisonment, and even of convenient exile when the group decided to appeal to the Holy See (the action which inspired their name).

64) William Watson, A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibeticall Questions concerning Religion and State (London, 1602) pp. 44-45.

65) H. M. C. Salisbury MSS., XII, 405-6

66) Ibid., p. 406; Foley, I, 46.

67) Law, II, 245. The correct date is established by Usher, I, 181.

68) Jordan, II, 56.

69) Knox, p. 18.

70) C. R. S., X, 51.

71) H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., XV, 216-17.

72) H. G. Stafford, James VI of Scotland, (New York, 1940) pp. 238, 284-85. Like Essex, the new king had fostered hopes everywhere, without regard for consistency.

NOTES (Contd.)

73) Usher, I, 303.

74) M. A. Tierney, ed., Dodd's Church History of England (London, 1846), IX, xxxiii; J. S. Brewer, ed., Goodman's The Court and Times of James, II, 85.

75) Tierney, IV, xxxiv.

76) H. M. C., Salisbury MSS., XV, 216-17.

77) Usher, II, 99.

78) Foley, IV, 284, 372.

79) Usher, II, 176.

80) Tierney, IV, cxxxviii-cxxxix: certain priests "daily degenerate into false prophets or wolves, quorum Coripheus est ille Thomas Carpentarius, vel Wright, de quo jam alias saepe...."; Foley, VII, 1018-19; IV, 284, 372-73.

81) Foley, IV, 284.

82) Tierney, IV, cxxxix fn.

83) Foley, IV, 372.

84) Ibid, VII, 1018-19.

85) Jordan, II, 59, 85-6.

NOTES (Contd.)

86) Foley, VII, 1018-19.

87) Our last trustworthy information is that in 1612, he was serving as priest for the English Catholic refugees gathered at Antwerp (Pitzeuz, p. 813).

88) Tierney, IV, 137-38, cclxxxiii.

Drake University

Des Moines, Iowa.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "NEWS FROM SPAYNE AND HOLLAND" AND ITS BEARING ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE CONFESSIONS OF THE BLESSED HENRY WALPOLE, S.J.

W. F. Rea, S.J.

In an article contributed to "The Month" for November 1951 the present writer expressed doubt about the genuineness of the confessions which Henry Walpole is said to have written during his imprisonment in the Tower in 1594. These enigmatical confessions, which are in the Public Record Office, were published by Father Pollen in volume V of the Catholic Record Society Publication. In the article in "The Month" the present writer based his argument on the government's failure to use such compromising confessions, on the absence in Walpole's subsequent conduct and correspondence of any sign of such a moral collapse as these pages represent, and lastly on Walpole's apparent admission in the confessions that he translated and augmented 'Philopater', a remark so fantastic that Walpole could not have made it. For the development of these arguments I must refer my readers to the pages of "The Month". What is here aimed at is to show that the book which Walpole really did "translate and augment" is the anonymous work, entitled "News from Spayne and Holland".

In proving this point the writer will rely mainly on three sources, on Father Creswell's life of Walpole, which was published a year after he died (1), on the actual book, "News from Spayne and Holland", and finally on the confessions which Walpole is alleged to have written in the Tower. To cite the confessions may indeed seem a strange procedure, for the main conclusion of this article is that

the confessions cannot be trusted. But it is not my intention to show that the confessions are false from beginning to end. On the contrary they contain much that is true. But, since they have been tampered with, their evidence can hardly be accepted, unless it is confirmed from other sources. The text of the confessions, as edited by Father Pollen, divides them into ten. The first four are not in Walpole's handwriting, and contain little that is compromising. Indeed, a strange feature of these very extraordinary confessions is that the most damaging passages are those in the writer's own hand, not in those written down for him by a notary employed by the government. I am not concerned with these four confessions, nor with the seventh and eighth, which are very short, and are also not in Walpole's handwriting. We are left then with the fifth, sixth, ninth and tenth, which were apparently written by Walpole himself, and which contain his most abject acts of submission to the religious demands of the government. It is these which it seems impossible to accept. They contain a certain amount that is true; the fifth in particular is a valuable source of information about Walpole's life in 1593, and some use will be made of it in these pages. But the mistake about "Philopater" shows that there is falsehood mixed with the truth, and so, unless the information which they give can be confirmed from other sources, it cannot be accepted.

After this necessary preface, we approach the main point of this article, namely the connection between Walpole, and "News from Spayne and Holland". While writing this book, the narrator, who recounts the news, mentions his own travels from late September 1592 until the late summer of the next year. Now these correspond strikingly with Walpole's own movements during this time.

Both left north-west Europe by sea for Spain towards the end of 1592 (2). Both reached Seville about Christmas (3). Both had some acquaintance with the newly-opened seminary there. By September 1st the narrator was back in north-west Europe; Walpole got back from Spain to Belgium later in the same month (4). Side by side with these similarities there are discrepancies; the author of "News from Spayne and Holland" represents himself as having been in England as recently as October 1592 (5), and as writing from Amsterdam. Walpole, on the contrary, had not returned to England since his departure in 1582, and, as far as we know, he had never been to Amsterdam. These differences however can easily be explained, for, whoever the anonymous author of "News from Spayne and Holland" may have been, it suited him to assume the role of one in recent touch with England, and it suited him too to represent the discussion about the succession to the English crown as taking place in Calvinist Holland, not in Belgium, the territories of His Most Catholic Majesty, where Walpole actually was at the end of September 1593.

Another circumstance connecting the book with Walpole is the sermon which it reports at great length, which was delivered by a student of the Seville seminary on the solemn celebration of the Feast of St. Thomas of Canterbury, December 29, 1592. The author makes it clear that the occasion was made as impressive as possible, and that the great personages of the city were present at the Mass. This we can well understand, for it was important to win sympathy and support for the new venture. It was during this Mass that the sermon in question was preached. Now the author of "News from Spayne and Holland" gives the sermon very fully, twelve out of the eighty-one pages of his

book being devoted to it (6). In places he records in direct speech the actual words of the speaker. Indeed, so full a report would not have been possible, had not the writer been making notes at the time, or had he not been using such notes made by another, or indeed the notes of the speaker himself. Now Walpole was in a position to write such a report, for he was at Seville at the time, having reached it shortly before, and at this time he was discussing the newly founded seminary with Persons.

What makes the connection between Walpole and the sermon recorded at such length in "News from Spayne and Holland" still stronger, is that there is evidence that Walpole himself was in part the writer of the sermon. Eighteen years later Father Persons wrote an account of the foundation of the Seville seminary (7) in which he also mentioned the sermon preached on the Feast of St. Thomas of Canterbury 1592, and from which we incidentally learn that the preacher on that occasion was John Worthington. This account of the foundation of Seville has unfortunately perished, but it was copied by Father Christopher Grene about 1680, and he explicitly describes the sermon as having been "composita a Personio, scripta ab Henrico Walpole" (8), which I take to mean that Persons decided the main points of the sermon, and Walpole amplified it, so that ultimately John Worthington might deliver it. Father Grene was transcribing Persons' own autographed account, so there seems little room for error.

Hence the narrator in "News from Spayne and Holland", besides making journeys that correspond strikingly closely with those of Walpole, incorporates in his account

a large part of a sermon preached at the seminary at Seville when Walpole was there, and which a trustworthy authority says that Walpole actually wrote. Finally, in the ninth confession that Walpole is alleged to have made in the Tower, there is evidence that he knew about the book. Here we find in what seems to be his own handwriting the following words: "I know Persons to have written a relacion of the seminaries and residences erected in Spain, and therein to promise a discourse of the divers yt pretend title to this realm, and opinion of men therein. The first was finishing at my departure from Spayne, and I believe is printed by this, and the second in hand." (9). Now this is a concise and accurate description of "News from Spayne and Holland" and was given by Walpole himself. No one else in the Tower was in a position to describe the book so accurately. Walpole knew the contents of the book, knew when it was finished, and knew when it was intended to publish it. Had the words in the confessions, in what appears to be his own handwriting, asserted that he had "translated and augmented" this book about the seminaries and residences in Spain, there would be no call for this article. Walpole could certainly have made that remark. What he could not have done was to say that he had "translated and augmented" another book altogether, namely "Philopater", with which in reality he had had no concern.

From an examination of "News from Spayne and Holland" it seems fairly easy to distinguish Walpole's contribution, that is his "augmentation", and Persons' contribution, which Walpole merely translated. The first part, up to page 22, describes the seminary at Seville, and includes the sermon preached by John Worthington, and also describes other work being done by English Catholics in

Spain. All this would have been well within Walpole's competence, and there is no reason why he should not have written the whole of this part. From page 22 to page 41 the character of the book is quite different. The author is there discussing whether the religious policy of the English government was wise, even from a political point of view. He discusses relations between Anglicans and Puritans, and finally approaches the subject of the succession to the throne. Now all these are questions in which, as far as we know, Walpole had no particular interest. Translation apart, this section of the book seems to be entirely by Persons, and indeed it is an introduction to his treatise on the succession, which was to be published in the next year. So the book agrees perfectly with Walpole's own words. It was a work of Persons, which he "translated and augmented"; but the book was not "Philopater".

It is, I think, possible to trace how "News from Spayne and Holland" came to be written and published, and thereby to obtain some further confirmation of its authorship. There is a reference during the course of it to the parliament ending on April 10, 1593, and so the book could not have been finished until a few weeks after that date. Now it was published by Verstegan at Antwerp (10). From the authority of the confessions, and of Father Creswell's life, taken together, it appears that Walpole spent about two months in Seville with Father Persons, and that they then travelled together to Madrid, where Persons remained, Walpole going on to the seminary at Valladolid. Here he was made Minister, in other words, he was charged with the temporal administration of the college (11). He was here on April 10, when the

English parliament was dissolved. In June Persons came to Valladolid and decided to send Walpole on the English mission. By the time he had had an interview with Philip II, in the hope of getting instructions which would lead the royal officials in the Netherlands to hasten the promised donations to the newly founded college of St.Omers, and by the time he had found a ship, it was early September. Later that month he reached Belgium. As had been said, he finished the book some weeks after April 10, 1593, and so probably while he was at Valladolid, or while he was actually at sea. Now this explains something during this period of his life, which otherwise remains mysterious, namely a visit which he paid to Antwerp during the two months before he left for England (12). During this period he had one mission to fulfil, namely to see that the instructions of Philip II about supplying money to St. Omers were carried out. Apart from this, his only orders were to make arrangements for his journey to England. It was upon this latter that almost all his thoughts were directed. Father Creswell says that he despatched all the business connected with St. Omers quickly, entrusting to others what he could not do himself, owing to his intense desire to leave for England as soon as possible (13). He was in fact afraid that if he delayed, an order might come, telling him to remain for some time at St.Omers. Now, in spite of his haste, and of his anxiety to leave for England, Walpole left St. Omers, and went inland to Brussels, and then later, paid a visit to Antwerp, before finally returning to St. Omers to make the final arrangements for his crossing to England. Nothing could have distracted him from his dominant purpose, namely his mission to England, except affairs of great importance. We know that the purpose of his visit to Brussels was to interview

Count Mansfeldt, Count Fuentes, and Estaban de Ibarra, Philip II's chief representatives in the Netherlands, about St. Omers, but it is not immediately obvious why he should visit Antwerp. His authorship of "News from Spayne and Holland" gives us a perfectly sufficient reason. He had finished the work within the last few months, and probably within the last few weeks. Verstegan, who within the next six months printed four thousand copies of it, lived at Antwerp. Further, from Antwerp Walpole wrote to Father Persons, who was as much concerned with the book as himself, though unfortunately the letter seems to have perished (14). Putting all this together, the history of "News from Spayne and Holland" would seem to have been as follows. Father Persons provided the general ideas, and probably wrote in Latin what, on being translated into English, became the last half of the final work. The first half of the book is Walpole's amplification of Persons' ideas, including those which formed the main points of the sermon, preached on December 29, 1592. The work could therefore rightly be described as a "translation and augmentation" of one of Persons. Some of it must date from his weeks at Seville; some of it from his time at Valladolid, or even after. Indeed he probably finished it off on his voyage to Belgium. He then made a journey to Antwerp, to hand it over to Verstegan, and finally wrote from the same city to Father Persons, to give him an account of what had happened. By the time the first copies of the book were printed Walpole was in the Tower.

The evidence here provided seems to make it certain that Walpole was in part the author of "News from Spayne and Holland". It is equally certain that he had no connection with "Philopater". Now he could not have gone

out of his way (15) to confuse in his confessions a book which he had actually written, and which had occupied his attention for nearly a year, with another book, with which he had had no concern. Still less could he have repeated the mistake (16). So the sentences about "Philopater", though apparently in Walpole's hand, were really written by another, who put down, not what Walpole said, but what he thought he said; the confessions therefore are not what they seem to be, and, unless confirmed from other sources, cannot be trusted. Least of all can we accept the humiliating submission to the government's religious demands, for which not a vestige of evidence exists, outside these very suspect pages.

NOTES

1. Joseph Creswell, Historia de la Vida y Martyrio que padecio en Inglaterra.....el P. Henrique Valpolo. Madrid. 1596.

2. News from Spayne and Holland, p.1.; C.R.S.V, pp. 247, 253.

3. News from Spayne etc., p.3.; C.R.S.V, Ibid.

4. News from Spayne etc., p.41; Diary of the Walloon College of St. Omers. Enghien MSS. c. 1330. All this information about Walpole is confirmed by Creswell's life, pp. 6-9.

5. News from Spayne, etc., p.1.

NOTES (Contd.)

6. From page 5 to page 11. Only every second page in the book is numbered, and it actually contains 81 pages, though the last page is numbered 41.

7. Catholic Record Society Publications, XIV, pp. 1-13.

8. C.R.S. XIV, p.9. Note.

9. C.R.S. V, p.263.

10. I am indebted for this knowledge to Mr. David Rogers of the Bodleian Library. It is worth noting that a priest, Robert Bardwys, confessed before Richard Young on March 31, 1594 that Verstegan had shown him a copy of "News from Spayne and Holland", "which is now in the press, presently to be printed." A marginal note adds that 4,000 were already printed. Hatfield Papers, IV, p.498. This, of course, was three months after Walpole's arrest.

11. For these details see Creswell, op. cit. pp. 6 - 13; C.R.S., V, pp. 247, 253-4.

12. C.R.S., V, pp. 248, 253. Creswell, op. cit. p.9, quoting a letter written by Walpole to Persons on November 13, 1593.

13. op. cit. p. 9.

14. The letter sent to Persons by Walpole while he was at Antwerp is mentioned in Walpole's letter, already referred to, which was written at St. Omers on November 13. Creswell, op. cit. p.9.

NOTES (Contd.)

15. The mention of Philopater begins as follows, "In the 11 article I had forgotten naming Philopaters book to meancion yt it was begunne to be translated etc." C.R.S. v.pp.265, 267.

16. He twice mentions that he translated Philopater, C.R.S. v, pp.265, 267, and on the second occasion adds in a marginal note, "This booke at my departure (i.e. from Spain) was not halfe done." Actually Philopater was translated at least eight months before Walpole left Spain.

SOME NOTES ON THE FAMILIES OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS

W.P. Jeffcock and L.E. Whatmore

V.JOHN HAMBLEY. Secular Priest. Salisbury. April.1587. He was born at St. Mabyn, near Bodmin. As he is described as "alias Tregwithan" it is likely that his father was John Hambley who was assessed in 1538 as holding one tenement at Tregwithan, containing one acre of land etc. He was probably the same John Hambley who possessed goods in St. Dreward of value 40/-s in 1543. In 1569 a John Hambley paid a rent of 10/-s. for part of Lainayle. The Hambleys are an old and widespread Cornish family. A Sir John Hamley of Halwyn was valet to the Black Prince. A junior branch of the family established itself at Trebetherick in the parish of St. Mabyn by about 1427 and resided there until about 1800. (Ref. Edmund H. Hambley. The Family of Hamley. Printed for private circulation. c. 1946.).

V.ROBERT SUTTON. Secular Priest. Stafford. 27 July. 1587. He was born at Burton-on-Trent and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. (Ref. In the Christ Church Buttery Books his name appears 1561-71).

B.HUGH MORE. Gentleman. Lincoln Inn Fields. 28 Aug.1588. He was born at Grantham c.1563, son of Robert More J.P., who was M.P. for Grantham and died 1595, by his first wife Gabriel Armstrong. His father married secondly Goditha Green, and by her had issue among others, Alexander More, Alderman of Grantham, Gabriel More D.D. Prebendary of Westminster, Susan, wife of Sir Richard Green, Elizabeth, wife of Francis Everingham of Barton-on-Humber. (Ref. Lincs Pedigrees. Vol.III.pp.687-8.)

B. RALPH CROCKETT. Secular Priest. Chichester. 1 Oct. 1588. Sizar, Christ's College, Cambridge, Nov. 1568, and later Gloucester Hall, Oxford. (Ref. Information A.L.Peck, Librarian, Christ's Coll.)

V. THOMAS PORMORT. Secular Priest. St. Paul's Churchyard. 20 Feb. 1592. (or Pormont, alias Whitgift, White, Pryce, Meres). He was born c.1559 at Little Limber, Lincs, and educated at Cambridge. He was son of George Pormort of Grays Inn, sometime Mayor of Grimsby, and his mother was Elizabeth, daughter of Philip Bleasby of Bleasby. He had an elder brother John of Utterby, and a sister Anne, married Wm. Booth of Wooton. (Ref. Lincs. Pedigrees. Vol.4. 1904).

V. WILLIAM GIBSON. Layman. York. 29 Nov. 1596. He was born near Ripon, and is most probably identified as the son of Robert Gibson of Tydd St.Mary, Lincs, and Isabella, daughter of John Pullen of Killinghall, Yorks. The William in the pedigree may well be the martyr, as an Anne Gibson and her son Richard of Stavely are returned as Recuants in 1604. It is possible, as Gillow suggests, although he was unaware of this pedigree that they are the martyr's widow and son. (Ref. Visit of Yorks. 1563/4. Harl. 1881. p.140,)

V. THURSTON HUNT. Secular Priest. Lancaster. March. 1601. Alias Greenlow. He was born at Carlton Hall, Leeds, second son of Gilbert Hunt of Carlton and Dorothy, daughter of William Mallet of Normanton. His mother married secondly a Mr. Grosvenor. His elder brother, Gilbert married Alice Ragget and had four children. He was in the service of Charles I in 1644. The Hunt pedigree begins 10 Edward I

with William of Carlton-in-Rothwell. (Ref. Yorks Pedigrees. Vol.II. Harleian. 1943. p. 241-2.)

B. RICHARD LANGHORNE. Barrister. Tyburn. 14 July. 1679. He was younger son of William Langhorne of the Inner Temple and Laetitia, daughter of Eustace Needham of Wymondley, Herts. The family was originally settled at The Fryers, Beds, and several members were eminent barristers of Middle Temple. His great grandfather was William Langhorne of Beds., who married Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Borne of Bedford; his grandfather, also William, married Anne, daughter of William Panele of London. His father had three sisters, wives respectively of William Baxter of the Middle Temple, George Robinson and Thomas Phipps. The Martyr's wife was Dorothy, a Protestant, daughter of Thomas Legate of Havering, Essex, and she married secondly Bernard Smithson. His son, Richard Langhorne, edited his father's "Considerations" in 1687, and two other sons, Charles and Francis, became priests, Francis being at the English College, Madrid, in 1677. (Ref. Visit.of Herts. 1886. p.71; C.R.S. Vol. XXIX. p.101).

B. THOMAS WHITEBREAD. Jesuit. Tyburn. 20 June. 1679. (alias Harcott, or Harcourt.). His father seems to have been John Whitebread of Writtle, son of John Whitebread and John Vaughan. He married Magdalene, daughter of Nicholas Waldegrave of Borley, who was sister of Frances, Countess of Portland. (Refs. Visit.of Essex. 1634 originally certified 1561; do.1632. p.320; do.1558. p.126;do.1552. p.17.)

B. RALPH SHERWIN. Secular Priest. Tyburn. 1 Dec.1581. He was born Rodsley, Derbyshire. His uncle was John

Woodward, Rector of Ingatestone, Essex, who was probably the means of his nomination to a Fellowship at Exeter College, Oxford, by Sir William Petre. (Ref. Information given by the Sub-Rect. of Exeter College, Oxford.)

B. JOHN BODEY. Gentleman. Andover. 2 Nov. 1583. His father was John Bodey (Boddy or Boddie), who was Mayor of Wells 1561-2 & 1574. A John Bodey was a Freeman of Wells 1543 by patrimony. (Ref. Information from the Town Clerk of Wells, H.J.Dodd; Wells City Charters ed.D.V.Shelton.)

B.JOHN FELTON. Gentleman. St. Paul's Churchyard. 8 Aug. 1570. He was born at Bermondsey of a Norfolk family. There is no pedigree, but there are traces of a Norfolk family of Filton. John Breton of Witchingham, temp. Richard II, married Mary, daughter and heiress of Hamon Filton of Litcham. There was also a family of this name settled at Playford in Suffolk. In the registers of St.Mary Magdalene Bermondsey, there is a marriage on 20 July, 1557, of John Filton and Ellen Godwin. This entry appears to record the martyr's marriage, and in a list of Recusants for 1577 there appears "John Strangman and his wife, late the wife of Mr Filton". The martyr had a son, Thomas, also later a martyr, a daughter, Frances, afterwards Mrs Salisbury, whose relation was used in compiling her brother's life. Another daughter, Frances, joined the English Convent, Louvain, in 1592. (Refs. Visit. of Norfolk(Harl.), 1891.p.54; Register of St Mary Magdalene Bermondsey. Exeter, 1894; C.S. Durrant. A Link between Flemish Mystics and English Martyrs, 1925; Royal Commission of Historical Monuments, vol.V. East London. 1930. p.70, for Bermondsey Abbey, the probable residence of the Feltons.)

THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE BLESSED ROBERT ANDERTON

T. B. Trappes Lomax

The poem here printed shows that this martyr was born, not in Lancashire as has been generally thought, but in the Isle of Man. It occurs on p. 145 of a MS. book known as "The Great Hodge Podge" which has always been in the possession of the Blundell family of Crosby co. Lanc.

It is probably in the handwriting of William Blundell of Crosby who was born in 1560, in the same year, that is, as Anderton. Blundell was consequently twenty-six years old when Anderton was executed in the Isle of Wight in 1586. He died in 1630.

I cannot identify the priest who composed the poem. The alias Malton is unknown to me.

The poem is reproduced as exactly as the difficulty of reading it has permitted. The brackets and underlinings and marginal notes are as in the MS.

Thanks are due to Mrs. Whitlock of Crosby for permission to print the poem and to M. R. Trappes-Lomax for transcribing it.

\+

A priest
Born in
ye Isle
of man

\+ This ballad was made by a virtuous & lerned priest called Mr Malton, whose true name was (name not given) in honour & memorie of one Mr Robert Anderton preest & martyr

A Thousand yeares from Christ his birthe
five hundreth eighty sixe
When Martial Mars in hatefull hands
His bloody sword did fixe
A sacred sainte whom the Iland + sands
+ The Ile of Man
a fruitfull soyle did yield;
A faith most firme his Targate was
a constant harte his sheild
The learned schooles he did forsake
though longinge to his right
And sayled throughe the surgenge seas
towards the Ile of Wight
In Iland borne in Iland bredd
an Iland brought him up,
Int' Iland (loe) nowe comen againe
to drinke of Christes cup
Reave Captaine Carie caught him up
as Eagle doth her praye
From thence he went the Iudge before
to Winchester next daye
To plead the cause of Iustice there
his maister Christ him sent
His cause is cleare the Church his
truth
for wh his liffe hee spent
When that his Iudgment passed was
he spoke theise words most sweet
(O holy lord of Saboth god
with whome I nowe shall meete).

Sancts, Sancts,
Sancts, Domins,
Deus Sabaoth.

non nobis Domine
non nobis, sed nōī
tuo da gloriam

And sange this Verse: (nc honoure
lord
no honour give to us
But to thy sacred name shewe it);
& then in prose spoke thus;

Alieni insurrexūt
aduersum me, et for-
tes quaesierūt ani-
mā meā, et nō ppo-
-suerūt deū ante
conspectum suum
Ecce enim Deus ad-
-iutor meus et Do-
mins susceptor est
animae meae

(Againste me strangers risen are
the stronge my soule have sought
Not settinge god before their sight
who dearly hath them bought
Behould how god my helper is
& safeguard of my soule
A sheeld most suer at all assayes).

in spiritte he spake this whoule---
whole

The hurdle cannot mee dismaye
nor flames of fyer tormente
Loe hateful hangmans knife to see
with joy I am contente
Come hangman come & make me suer
thou spends thy time in wast.
With bloody hands pull out my harte
of mee good leave thou hast.
Bring hurdle nowe knit knott on rope
whett kniffe with speed fetche fyer
In Christ his cause to end my liffe
it is my whole desyer.
Let slydinge knot knit up our end
of mortall myssery
The skyes soe cleave that clymbe I maye
to etternally
This death but short will bring to mee
a lyffe that hath no end

To live with saints & Angells bright
such Comfort christ doth send.

NOTES

1) "The learned schools he did forsake." A Robert Anderton of Brasenose College, Oxford, matriculated 20 July 1578, aged eighteen.

2) "Reeve Captaine Carie". Sir Robert Carey, afterwards 2nd Baron Hunsdon, held the appointment of Knight Marshal and Captain of the Isle of Wight from 1582 to 1603.

3) "An Iland brought him up". He was at Rivington Grammar School, co. Lanc., in 1575. (M.M. Kay, History of Rivington and Blackrod Grammar School, 41.)

4) "to eternally". The missing word (presumably "heaven") is illegible in the MS.

SELECTIVE INDEX OF PERSONS
Vol. 1 No.1-3

	Pages:
Abbot (John)	22-33
Anderton (Robert)	235-238
Arne (Thomas)	149-156
Berkeley, of Spetchley, family of	45-58
Bray (Henry)	125-127
Challoner (Richard) Bishop	78-79
Englefield, of Berkshire, Wilts., etc., family of	131-148
Garnet (Henry)	7-21
Hawarden (Edward)	40-44
Huddleston (John)	168-188
Jaye (Henry)	86-111
Leckonby (Thomas)	34-39
Mawhood, of Smithfield and Finchley, family of	59-77
Mawhood (William)	59-77
Persons (Robert)	220-230
Seymour (William) Duke of Somerset	117-119
Somers (William)	128-130
Vaux, of Harrowden, family of	120-124
Walpole (Henry)	220-230
Webbe (Samuel)	149-156
White (John) alias Leckonby	34-39
White (Luke)	34-39
Wright (Thomas)	189-219

CORRIGENDA - Vol.I No.3

Page	Line	
165	7	omit "and".
169	28	replace exclamation mark with colon.
170	3	for "Adnomarum" read "Audomarum".
173	23	for "Burk's" read "Burke's".
177	6	omit "in 1704".
187	-------	2nd generation of correct pedigree, for "Rich" read "Richard". 3rd generation of correct pedigree, all names given should be shown as stemming from Joseph, eldest child of the 2nd generation.
192	9	for "obscure in 1594" read "obscure until in 1594".
197	32	for "Coucil" read "Council".
203	14	for "to treason" read "of treason".
204	9	for "protegée" read "protégé".
207	16	for "shies" read "shires".
212	2	for "Ancestors" read "Forefathers".
220	7	for "Publication" read "Publications".
226	8	for "As had been said" read "As has been said".
228	-------	Note 2, for "C.R.S.V." read "C.R.S. V". Note 3, for "C.R.S.V." read "C.R.S. V". Note 4, for "Enghien MSS. c. 1330" read "Enghien MSS. c. 130".
236	5	the words " + The Ile of Man" are written (and should be printed) in the r.h. margin.
	24	the second word is the abbreviation "wh".

BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES,

1534 - 1829

Materials towards a biographical dictionary of Catholic History in the British Isles from the breach with Rome to Catholic Emancipation.

THE ARUNDEL PRESS · BOGNOR REGIS